

(e) the details of action taken/contemplated against those responsible for delay?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI BALASAHEB VIKHE PATIL): (a) and (b) State Bank of Indore have reported that consent letters for pension of 14 officials of Janak Puri Branch, New Delhi were inadvertently not forwarded by the branch to the Head Office in time.

(c) Bank has further reported that 14 letters/representations have been received by them since 1st April, 1999 in this regard.

(d) and (e) According to the bank, the Board of Trustees of Pension Fund of the Bank at their meeting held on 28.7.2000 have approved acceptance of the pension options of the said 14 officials. The bank is examining the question of fixing responsibility of the concerned officials responsible for the delay.

Non-disclosure of NPAs by SBI

1802. SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether unlike other banks, SBI has so far avoided disclosing its NPAs in absolute numbers, as against a percentage of total lending; and

(b) if so, the details thereof and the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI BALASAHEB VIKHE PATIL): (a) In its Balance Sheet as on 31st March, 2000, State Bank of India has disclosed movement of NPAs, as per the norms prescribed by RBI.

(b) Does not arise.

Finalisation of Competition Policy

1803. SHRI JIBON ROY: Will the Minister of LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have finalised any competition policy in view of the rapid liberalisation, globalization and privatisation undertaken by Government; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING AND MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI ARUN JAITLEY):

(a) and (b) The High-Level Committee on Competition Policy and Law headed by Shri SVS Raghavan has recommended that Government should formulate a Competition Policy for the general guidance of all concerned and should also enact a Competition Law for enforcing it.

The Committee submitted its Report to the Government in May, 2000. The Government has circulated the Report widely among the general public, State Government/Union Territories and Central Ministries/Departments seeking their views and suggestions.

The Government is yet to take a final view. It would do so after studying carefully the general thrust of the views and suggestions received.

Additional Power to CEC

†1804. DR. D. MASTHAN: Will the Minister of LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that some additional power had been sought by the Chief Election Commissioner to have disciplinary control over the staff engaged in election work and to implement the model code of conduct;

(b) if so, the salient features of the request made by Chief Election Commissioner;

(c) whether Government have not accepted the request; and

(d) if so, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING AND THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI ARUN JAITLEY): (a) and (b) The Election Commission of India has sought disciplinary powers in respect of the staff deputed for election work in accordance with the provisions contained in Section 13CC of the Representation of the People Act, 1950 and Section 28A of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 read with Article 324 of the Constitution so that Election Commission may have the necessary legal and administrative powers to take action against officials connected with revision of electoral rolls and conduct of elections. The Election Commission also desired that the Model Code of Conduct should be applicable from the date of announcement of the elections as held in Harbans Singh Jalal's case by the Punjab and Haryana High Court.

†Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.